International Journal of Reproduction, Contraception, Obstetrics and Gynecology
*Vijay AS et al. Int J Reprod Contracept Obstet Gynecol. 2025 Dec;14(12):4444-4448*
www.ijrcog.org
pISSN 2320-1770 | eISSN 2320-1789

DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.18203/2320-1770.ijrcog20253928

**Review Article**

# Frontiers in fertility: a review of breakthroughs in assisted reproductive technology

**Asha S. Vijay[1], Fyzullah Syed[2], Suresh K. Karri[3]***

[1]GarbhaGudi Institute of Reproductive Health and Research (GGIRHR) Pvt Ltd, Bengaluru, Karnataka, India
[2]Department of Embryology, GarbhaGudi IVF Centre, Bengaluru, Karnataka, India
[3]Department of Research and Publications, GarbhaGudi Institute of Reproductive Health and Research (GGIRHR) Pvt Ltd, Bengaluru, Karnataka, India

**Received:** 24 October 2025
**Revised:** 14 November 2025
**Accepted:** 15 November 2025

***Correspondence:**
Dr. Suresh K. Karri,
E-mail: research.support@ggirhr.com



## ABSTRACT

Assisted reproductive technology (ART) is undergoing a transformation driven by emerging biomedical innovations. This review examines recent advances including modulation of the endometrial microbiome, non-invasive preimplantation genetic testing (niPGT) (usually referred as NIPT - non-invasive prenatal genetic testing), mitochondrial replacement therapy (MRT), and reproductive tissue engineering and evaluates their clinical efficacy, ethical implications, and impact on reproductive outcomes. For instance, niPGT has demonstrated up to 80% concordance with invasive testing and reducing biopsy-associated risks. Endometrial microbiota profiling is increasingly used to personalize embryo transfer timing, improving implantation up to 30% of previously unsuccessful in vitro fertilization (IVF) cycles. Innovations in ovarian tissue cryopreservation and 3D bioprinting of reproductive tissues offer fertility solutions for patients with cancer or congenital anomalies. However, these advancements in technology raise ethical concerns around embryo manipulation, germline modification, and equitable access. By synthesizing recent findings, this paper outlines the future trajectory of ART, emphasizing the need for evidence-based integration and regulatory oversight.

**Keywords:** Assisted reproductive technology, Non-invasive preimplantation genetic testing, Mitochondrial replacement therapy, Invitro fertilization, Endometrial microbiome, Recurrent implantation failure

## INTRODUCTION

Assisted Reproductive Technology (ART) refers to medical interventions used to achieve pregnancy in individuals facing infertility. Since the advent of in vitro fertilization (IVF) in 1978, ART has continuously evolved, incorporating technological, genetic, and biomedical breakthroughs. The global ART market is projected to reach USD 45 billion by 2027, reflecting increasing demand and innovation.[1] This review discusses six major developments in ART and their applications in reproductive medicine, namely, endometrial microbiome, non-invasive genetic screening, mitochondrial replacement therapy, ovarian tissue cryopreservation, 3D bioprinting of reproductive tissues, and stem cell treatment. For each technology, the article outlines the underlying methods or test principles, including sequencing-based microbiome analysis, cell-free DNA testing, spindle-chromosome transfer techniques, cryopreservation protocols, bioprinting techniques, and stem cell differentiation strategies. It further explores what each technology addresses ranging from improving embryo implantation and reducing genetic risks to fertility preservation and tissue regeneration. The benefits of these

innovations, such as increased safety, personalization, and expanded reproductive options, are weighed against their limitations, including technical challenges, limited long-term data, ethical concerns, and regulatory hurdles. Together, these insights provide a forward-looking perspective on the integration of emerging technologies in fertility care.

**Table 1: Summary of the latest technologies in assisted reproductive technologies (ART).**

| S. no. | Technology | Clinical availability | Adoption timeline | Key limitations | Regulatory/ethical issues |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Endometrial microbiome profiling | Available (clinical use) | Already used in select IVF labs | Lack of test standardization; variable reproducibility; uncertain causality with infertility | Need for consensus on diagnostic thresholds and treatment pathways |
| 2 | Non-invasive PGT (niPGT) | Emerging (not yet standard) | Within 3–5 years (pending trials) | Low DNA yield; maternal contamination; variable concordance with biopsy methods | Requires validation for standalone use; regulatory guidance on non-invasive embryo screening needed |
| 3 | Mitochondrial replacement therapy (MRT) | Restricted to few countries | Experimental; country-dependent | Technical challenges (mitochondrial carryover); unknown long-term risks | Germline modification ethics; banned in many countries; allowed under strict UK guidelines (e.g., HFEA) |
| 4 | Ovarian tissue cryopreservation and transplantation | Established (special centers) | Widely used in cancer fertility | Not safe for leukemia patients (risk of malignant cell reintroduction); need for ischemia-reducing protocols | Regulated as part of onco-fertility protocols requires institutional oversight and tissue banking standards |
| 5 | 3D Bioprinting of reproductive tissues | Preclinical (animal studies) | 5–10 years (dependent on trials) | Vascularization and innervation barriers; limited to small animal models | Needs preclinical and clinical safety data; future ethical concerns for uterus printing and implantation |
| 6 | Stem cell therapy (e.g., for Asherman's, POI) | Early clinical use (select cases) | 3–7 years (based on trial results) | Unstandardized protocols; unclear long-term safety; small sample sizes in current studies | Requires regulatory approval for cell therapy; ethical review for autologous/allogeneic use and informed consent frameworks |

## ENDOMETRIAL MICROBIOME

The endometrial microbiome primarily composed of *Lactobacillus*-dominant flora plays a pivotal role in successful implantation and pregnancy maintenance. Dysbiosis, characterized by a reduction in *Lactobacillus* species and overgrowth of anaerobes such as *Gardnerella* and *Atopobium*, is associated with recurrent implantation failure (RIF), miscarriage, and preterm labor.[2-4] Mechanistically, dysbiosis disrupts the immune milieu of the endometrium, triggering pro-inflammatory cytokine cascades that impair trophoblast invasion and decidualization.[5] Recent clinical trials employing microbiota profiling and targeted antibiotic or probiotic treatments have reported up to 30% improvement in implantation and live birth rates in RIF patients.[1,2] Few researchers highlight the role of the endometrial microbiome in fertility, focusing on diagnostic technologies such as 16S rRNA gene sequencing and metagenomic analysis used to profile microbial communities from endometrial samples.[6-9] These tests help identify microbial imbalances particularly the presence or absence of *Lactobacillus* species linked to implantation failure and infertility. The benefits include personalized treatment strategies, improved implantation rates, and the potential to guide targeted antibiotic or probiotic therapy. A key success story by Moreno et al showed significantly better IVF outcomes in women with *Lactobacillus*-dominated microbiota, supporting its clinical relevance.[10] However, limitations remain, including lack of standardization, variable test reproducibility, and uncertain causal relationships.

## NON-INVASIVE PREIMPLANTATION GENETIC TESTING (niPGT)

Conventional preimplantation genetic testing (PGT-A) involves trophectoderm biopsy, which carries risks of embryo damage and mosaicism misinterpretation. niPGT, which analyses cell-free DNA from spent embryo culture

media, offers a non-invasive alternative.[11-13] Studies show a concordance rate of 70–80% with invasive PGT, with ongoing efforts to enhance accuracy through next-generation sequencing and machine learning algorithms.[14,15] niPGT holds promise for widespread adoption, particularly in patients with limited embryo numbers or ethical concerns about embryo manipulation. However, niPGT faces challenges like low DNA yield, potential maternal contamination, and variable agreement with biopsy-based results, limiting its standalone use. A key study by Xu et al demonstrated about 78% concordance with conventional methods, supporting niPGT's potential as a promising tool in IVF embryo selection.[16] However, differences in DNA yield and contamination continue to raise technical challenges.

## MITOCHONDRIAL REPLACEMENT THERAPY (MRT)

MRT is designed to prevent transmission of mitochondrial DNA (mtDNA) disorders by replacing defective maternal mitochondria with healthy donor mitochondria. Techniques such as spindle transfer and pronuclear transfer are used to create embryos free from maternal mtDNA mutations.[17,18] MRT has resulted in live births in select clinical settings, although long-term safety and epigenetic effects remain under scrutiny. The technique has sparked ethical debates, particularly regarding germline modification and the creation of "three-parent" embryos.[19,20] While MRT offers life-changing benefits by reducing mitochondrial disorder risks, it faces ethical debates, technical hurdles like mitochondrial carryover, and limited long-term data. The landmark successful live birth in 2016 Dr John Zhang highlights its clinical promise, though broader adoption awaits further validation and regulatory consensus. Regulatory policies vary worldwide, with MRT approved under strict guidelines in the UK but prohibited in several other countries.[21]

## OVARIAN TISSUE CRYOPRESERVATION AND TRANSPLANTATION

Ovarian tissue cryopreservation is gaining traction as a fertility preservation method, particularly for prepubertal cancer patients or those requiring immediate gonadotoxic therapy.[22,23] Transplantation of thawed ovarian tissue has resulted in restoration of endocrine function and over 200 live births globally.[24] Advances in cryoprotectant solutions, vitrification techniques, and ischemia prevention strategies have improved graft longevity and follicular viability. Importantly, this technique bypasses the need for ovarian stimulation and can preserve thousands of primordial follicles in a single procedure.

Ovarian tissue cryopreservation is rapidly becoming a popular method for preserving fertility, especially for prepubertal cancer patients or those terminally ill patients, who need immediate gonadotoxic treatment that harms their ovaries. The transplantation of thawed ovarian tissue has successfully restored hormonal function and has resulted in over 200 live births worldwide.[24] Advances in cryoprotectant solutions, vitrification techniques, and strategies to prevent tissue damage during the process have significantly improved the longevity of grafts and the viability of follicles. Additionally, this technique eliminates the need for ovarian stimulation and can preserve thousands of primordial follicles in a single procedure. The first live birth following OTC/OTT was reported by Donnez et al marking a significant milestone in fertility preservation.[25] In patients with hematological cancers (e.g., leukemia), there is a risk of cancer cell contamination in ovarian tissue. It is considered unsafe in these patients, and therefore a limitation in leukemia patients.

## BIOPRINTING OF REPRODUCTIVE TISSUES

Bioprinting (3-Dimensional) enables the fabrication of biomimetic ovarian, endometrial, and uterine tissues using patient-derived cells and biocompatible scaffolds. Animal studies have shown successful ovulation and hormonal function using 3D-printed ovarian constructs.[26-28] These technologies offer future possibilities for uterine factor infertility and endocrine restoration. In 2017, researchers at Wake Forest used 3D bioprinting to create scaffold-based artificial ovaries from gelatin, a collagen derivative. They implanted these bioprosthetic ovaries into sterilized female mice.[29] This study offered proof-of-concept that bio-printed ovaries could restore fertility and hormone function, potentially benefiting cancer survivors or women with premature ovarian insufficiency. Challenges remain in vascularization, innervation, and regulatory approval, but ongoing research is rapidly addressing these barriers.[30]

## STEM CELL THERAPY

Stem cell therapy is emerging as a strategy to regenerate ovarian function, particularly in women with premature ovarian insufficiency (POI). Mesenchymal stem cells (MSCs) from bone marrow or adipose tissue have shown potential to restore folliculo-genesis and hormone secretion in animal models and small-scale human trials.[31-33] Mechanistically, MSCs exert paracrine effects that modulate the ovarian microenvironment, reduce fibrosis, and enhance angiogenesis. One of the success stories was from AIIMS, Delhi, wherein a woman with severe Asherman's syndrome and refractory endometrial atrophy who had failed multiple IVF cycles was intervened through Bone marrow-derived stem cells were isolated and infused into the sub-endometrial zone via hysteroscopy with outcome being significant improvement in the endometrial thickness, normalcy of menstrual flow, natural conception occurred, resulting in a live birth, reported in 2014.[34]

However, standardized protocols, long-term safety data, and ethical frameworks are necessary before routine clinical application.[35]

## CONCLUSION

Emerging technologies in assisted reproductive technology (ART) are revolutionizing fertility care, with varying degrees of clinical readiness. Endometrial microbiome profiling is already used to personalize embryo transfer, while non-invasive PGT (niPGT) shows promising accuracy but requires further validation. Mitochondrial replacement therapy (MRT) offers a solution for mitochondrial disorders but is ethically contentious and regulated differently across countries. Ovarian tissue cryopreservation is well-established for fertility preservation, though contraindicated in leukemia. Experimental approaches like 3D bioprinting of reproductive tissues and stem cell therapy show potential for restoring fertility and endocrine function but remain in early clinical or preclinical stages. Adoption of these innovations into routine ART practice will depend on addressing technical limitations, ensuring long-term safety, and developing consistent regulatory and ethical guidelines.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Authors would like to thank all the GGIRHR research team for their extensive work and support in the literature search and key inputs.

*Funding: No funding sources*
*Conflict of interest: None declared*
*Ethical approval: Not required*

## REFERENCES

1. Aderaldo JF, Rodrigues BH, Câmara MT, de Medeiros GT, Lanza DC et al. Main topics in assisted reproductive market: A scoping review. PLoS ONE. 2023;18(8):e0284099.
2. Takeuchi T, Doshida M, Karino A, Ishibashi Y, Saito S, Takaya Yukiko, et al. An intervention according to the results of a new endometrial microbiome testing improves ART outcomes in recurrent implantation failure patients. Fertility Sterility. 2024;2:270-82.
3. Chen RZ, Wang YF, Chen PG, Fang C, Li TT, Zhu YQ, et al. Clinical application of the endometrial microbiota test combined with personalized treatment in patients with repeated implantation failure. Reproduct Develop Med. 2024;8:18-23.
4. Moreno I, Simon C. Relevance of assessing uterine microbiota in infertility. Fertil Steril 2018;110(3):337-43.
5. Pelzer ES, Allan JA, Cunningham K, Mengersen K, Allan JM, Launchbury T, et al. Microbial colonization of follicular fluid: alterations in cytokine expression and adverse assisted reproduction technology outcomes. Hum Reprod. 2011;26(7):1799-812.
6. Franasiak JM, Werner MD, Juneau CR, Tao X, Landis J, Zhan Y, et al. Endometrial microbiome at the time of embryo transfer: next-generation sequencing of the 16S ribosomal subunit. J Assisted Reprod Genet. 2016;33(1):129-36.
7. Kyono K, Hashimoto T, Nagai Y, Sakuraba Y. Analysis of endometrial microbiota by 16S ribosomal RNA gene sequencing among infertile patients: correlation with embryo implantation. Reproduct Med Biol. 2019;18(4):364-70.
8. Korczynska L, Zeber-Lubecka N, Zgliczynska M, Zarychta E, Zareba K, Wojtyla C, et al. The role of microbiota in the pathophysiology of uterine fibroids – a systematic review. Front Cell Infect Microbiol. 2013;13:1177366.
9. Chen C, Song X, Wei W, Zhong H, Dai J, Lan Z, et al. The microbiota continuum along the female reproductive tract and its relation to uterine-related diseases. Nature Communications. 2017;8(1):875.
10. Klitzman R, Toynbee M, Sauer MV. Controversies concerning mitochondrial replacement therapy. Fertil Steril. 2015;103(2):344-56.
11. Li X, Hao Y, Chen D, Ji D, Zhu W, Zhu X, et al. Non-invasive preimplantation genetic testing for putative mosaic blastocysts: a pilot study. Hum Reprod. 2021;36(7):2020-34.
12. Xie P, Zhang S, Gu Y. Non-invasive preimplantation genetic testing for conventional IVF blastocysts. J Transl Med. 2022;20:396-415.
13. Li T, Chan C, Greenblatt E. A non-selection study to evaluate non-invasive preimplantation genetic testing for aneuploidy. Human Reproduction 2023;38(1):93-105.
14. Tsai NC, Chang YC, Su YR, Lin YC, Weng PL, Cheng YH, et al. Validation of Non-Invasive Preimplantation Genetic Screening Using a Routine IVF Laboratory Workflow. Biomedicines. 2022;10(6):1386.
15. Zaninovic N, Rosenwaks Z, Badiola A-C, Flores-Saiffe-Farías A, Mendizabal-Ruiz G, Nogueira D, et al. Artificial intelligence in embryo selection: a critical review. Fertil Steril. 2021;116(4):777-84.
16. Xu J, Fang R, Chen L, Chen D, Xiao JP, Yang W, et al. Non-invasive chromosome screening of human embryos by genome sequencing of embryo culture medium for in vitro fertilization. Proceedings of the National Acad Sci. 2016;113(42):11907–12.
17. Lyu Q, Zou W, Huang T. Recent advances in mitochondrial replacement therapy and its future expectations. Clin Transl Disc. 2025;2:18-26.
18. Klitzman R, Toynbee M, Sauer MV. Controversies concerning mitochondrial replacement therapy. Fertil Steril. 2015;103(2):344-56.
19. Zhang JJ, Liu H, Luo S, Lu Z, Chávez-Badiola A, Liu Z, et al. Live birth derived from oocyte spindle transfer to prevent mitochondrial disease. Reprod Biomed Online. 2017;34(4):361-8.
20. Baylis F. The ethics of creating children with three genetic parents. Reprod Biomed Online. 2013;26(6):531-4.
21. Alikani M, Fauser BCJ, García-Valesco JA, Simpson JL, Johnson MH. First birth following spindle transfer for mitochondrial replacement therapy: hope and

trepidation. Reprod Biomed Online. 2017;34(4):333-6.
22. Khattak H, Malhas R, Craciunas L, Afifi Y, Amorim CA, Fishel S, et al. Fresh and cryopreserved ovarian tissue transplantation for preserving reproductive and endocrine function: a systematic review and individual patient data meta-analysis. Human Reprod Update. 2022;28(3):400-16.
23. Gadek F, Lauren M. Thawing fertility: a view of ovarian tissue cryopreservation processes and review of ovarian transplant research. Fertility and Sterility. 2024;4:574-85.
24. Donnez J, Dolmans MM. Fertility preservation in women. N Engl J Med. 2017;377(17):1657-65.
25. Donnez J, Dolmans MM, Demylle D, Jadoul P, Pirard C, Squifflet J, et al. Livebirth after orthotopic transplantation of cryopreserved ovarian tissue. Lancet. 2004;364(9443):1405-10.
26. Nair R, Kasturi M, Mathur V, Seetharam RN, S Vasanthan K. Strategies for developing 3D printed ovarian model for restoring fertility. Clin Transl Sci. 2024;17(7):63-75.
27. Ji S, Guvendiren M. Recent Advances in Bioink Design for 3D Bioprinting of Tissues and Organs. Front Bioeng Biotechnol. 2017;5:23-30.
28. Laronda MM, Jakus AE, Whelan KA, Wertheim JA, Shah RN, Woodruff TK, et al. Initiation of puberty in a transgender girl using a 3D bioprinted ovary. Nat Commun. 2017;8:15261.
29. Laronda MM, Rutz AL, Xiao S. Whelan KA, Duncan FE, Roth EW, et al. A bioprosthetic ovary created using 3D printed microporous scaffolds restores ovarian function in sterilized mice. Nature Communications. 2017;8:15261.
30. Abaci A, Guvendiren M. Designing decellularized extracellular matrix-based bioinks for 3D bioprinting. Adv Healthc Mater. 2020;9(24):e2000734.
31. Kim HK, Kim TJ. Current Status and Future Prospects of Stem Cell Therapy for Infertile Patients with Premature Ovarian Insufficiency. Biomolecules. 2024;14(2):242-9.
32. Guo C, Ma Y, Situ Y, Liu L, Luo G, Li H, et al. Mesenchymal stem cell therapy for premature ovarian insufficiency: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Stem Cell Res Ther. 2021;12:6.
33. Ali I, Padhiar AA, Wang T, He L, Chen M, Wu S, Zhou Y, Zhou G. Stem Cell-Based Therapeutic Strategies for Premature Ovarian Insufficiency and Infertility: A Focus on Aging. Cells. 2022;11(23):3713.
34. Singh N, Shekhar B, Mohanty S, Kumar S, Seth T, Girish B. Autologous Bone Marrow-Derived Stem Cell Therapy for Asherman's Syndrome and Endometrial Atrophy: A 5-Year Follow-up Study. J Hum Reprod Sci. 2020;13(1):31-7.
35. Volarevic V, Lojk J, Arsenijevic N, Lukic ML, Stojkovic M. Ethical and safety issues of stem cell-based therapy. Stem Cell Rev Rep. 2018;14(4):388-400.

**Cite this article as:** Vijay AS, Syed F, Karri SK. Frontiers in fertility: a review of breakthroughs in assisted reproductive technology. Int J Reprod Contracept Obstet Gynecol 2025;14:4444-8.